

REMARKS

Response is hereby made to the Office Action dated January 16, 2004. By this Response, Applicant amended claims 1-2, 4-5, 11, 16, 18 and 20, and has cancelled claims 21-24 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-20 (3 independent and 17 dependent) therefore remain pending the application. *Although no fee or extension of time is believed to be required by this Response, the Commissioner is authorized and requested provide any extensions of time and/or to debit any fees that may be required by this Response (including any fees for additional claims or extensions of time) from Deposit Account No. 50-2091 to avoid abandonment of this Application.*

The Office Action rejects claims 1-16 and 19-24 under 35 USC § 102(e), citing US Patent No. 6,122,499 ("Magnusson"). The Office Action rejects claims 17-18 under 35 USC § 103, citing the Magnusson reference in combination with ordinary skill in the art. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in that neither reference fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of the amended claims, taken singly or in combination. In particular, no reference of record discloses at least the steps of *maintaining a database of subscriber unit identifiers and jurisdictional information associated with each of the plurality of subscriber unit* as now recited in claim 1. Similarly, no reference discloses at least a data processing system configured for *receiving an intercept order from a network intercept facility, the intercept order comprising a target communications node ID assigned by a network operations facility; decrypting the intercept order to thereby verify the network intercept facility; and separately decrypting the target communications node ID to thereby verify the network operations facility* as now recited in claim 18. Moreover, no reference discloses a communications system capable of the jurisdictional aspects recited in claim 20. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

While the Magnusson reference does indeed describe a system that provides lawful intercepts in a satellite communications environment, the system disclosed in that reference operates according to radically different principles than that described by the amended claims. In particular, the Magnusson system maintains a "master intercept list" for the system, with this master list being distributed across all of the satellites in the system. As a result, each satellite receives and checks each entry on the "master list", even when units on the list are not located within the footprint of the satellite. Besides the obvious technical inefficiencies posed by this scheme, the "master list" does not isolate intercepts that may be requested by different law enforcement agencies, some of which may have widely varying jurisdictional and legal authorities.

In contrast to the Magnusson system, the present claims now recite systems and methods incorporating a "jurisdictional database" that maintains location information about the various subscriber units located within a jurisdiction. As an intercept is requested, encrypted information about the target subscriber unit is incorporated into an intercept request, with cryptographic techniques verifying both the jurisdiction of the subscriber unit and the authority requesting the intercept. As a result, each intercept request can be processed individually, thereby maintaining greatly enhanced capability and legal compliance that would otherwise be difficult to achieve in a worldwide satellite environment. Because these jurisdictional and cryptographic features are not described in the prior art, favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present claims is requested.

Moreover, because the dependent claims inherit the restrictions of their parent independent claims, each of the dependent claims is now believed to be patentable as a matter of law, and a detailed analysis of the patentability of these claims is not required at this time.

Nevertheless, Applicant does not consent to any of the rejections found in the Office Action, and expressly reserves the right to separately dispute the patentability of any dependent claim at a later date, if necessary to do so.

Applicant has addressed each of the concerns set forth in the Office Action, and all of the pending claims are therefore believed to be allowable. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal the rejections set forth in the Office Action, and allowance of each of the remaining claims. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (480) 385-5060 or bcarlson@ifllaw.com.

Dated

4/16/2004

Respectfully submitted,



Brett A. Carlson
Reg. No. 39,928

Ingrassia Fisher & Lorenz P.C.
Customer No. 29906